

Each of the patent was discussed with regard to the fact that neither of them disclose attachments for a golf putter and do not disclose or suggest a unitary putter head comprising a single, solid, unitary body that is attached to a putter shaft. None of the devices disclosed or suggested by the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents provide for a putter head comprising a single, solid, unitary body. Therefore, it is clear that the combined teachings of these references do not disclose or suggest the presently claimed unitary putter head.

With regard to the § 103 rejection, as it pertains the pending independent Claims, what was stated in the Response dated March 4, 2003 is that:

"... with specific regard to independent Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together, do not disclose or suggest a putter head that comprises "a single, solid, unitary body having a front surface with a relatively small, centrally-located, flat ball contact surface that comprises a sweet spot of the putter head and lateral portions that taper rearwardly away from the ball contact surface".

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection and allowance of Claim 1 are respectfully requested.

With regard to independent Claim 9, and in view of the above arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together, do not disclose or suggest a putter head that comprises "a single, solid, unitary body having a front surface with a relatively small, centrally-located, flat ball contact surface that comprises a sweet spot of the putter head and lateral portions that taper rearwardly away from the ball contact surface".

These statements clearly address the § 103 obviousness rejection and not the § 102 rejection suggested by the Examiner. The fact that the teachings of each patent were separately discussed is not the issue. Since neither of the cited patents disclose or suggest a unitary putter head, it necessarily follows that the combined teachings of the cited patents do not disclose or suggest a unitary putter head.

In any event, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 9 are not obvious in view of the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 14 are considered patentable over the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together, based upon the patentability of Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection and allowance of Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,489,415 issued to Smith in view of US Patent No. 5,135,228 issued to Hawkins, Sr. in view of US Patent No. 6,402,638 issued to Kelly and US Patent No. 4,121,833 issued to Prueter. The Examiner cited the Kelly and Prueter patent as disclosing a shaft inserted into the practice putter head.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 7 and 15 are patentable over the cited patents, taken singly or together, based upon the patentability of Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection and allowance of Claims 7 and 15 are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,489,415 issued to Smith in view of US Patent No. 5,135,228 issued to Hawkins, Sr. and further in view of US Design Patent No. D234,962 issued to Swash. The Examiner cited the Swash patent as disclosing a shaft inserted into the practice putter head.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 7 and 15 are patentable over the cited patents, taken singly or together, based upon the patentability of Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of Claims 7 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 8, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,489,415 issued to Smith in view of US Patent No. 5,135,228 issued to Hawkins, Sr. and further in view of US Patent No. 5,388,832 issued to Hsu. The Examiner cited the Hsu patent as disclosing "a shaft 10 that has an offset and is inserted into the neck 16".

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 8, 11 and 16 are patentable over the cited patents, taken singly or together, based upon the patentability of Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of Claims 3, 8, 11 and 16 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-16 are not obvious in view of, the cited patents, taken singly or together, and are therefore patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. It is again respectfully submitted that the present response does not require further searching by the Examiner, and places this application in condition for allowance, or in any event, places it in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth W. Float
Registration No. 29,233

The Law Offices of Kenneth W. Float
Office Address: 2 Shire, Coto de Caza, CA 92679
Mailing Address: P. O. Box 80790, Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Telephone: (949) 459-5519
Facsimile: (949) 459-5520